

Dr. CLARKE's
Scripture Doctrine
OF THE
TRINITY
Examined.

To which are Added
Some *Remarks* on His
SENTIMENTS,
AND
A Brief Explanation of his *Doctrine*
by way of *Question* and *Answer*.

By EDWARD WELCHMAN, M. A.
Rector of *Lapworth* in *Warwickshire*.

OXFORD:
Printed by L. Lichfield, for A. Peisley Bookseller:
And are to be Sold by J. Knapton, W. Taylor,
H. Clements, W. Meadows and J. Morphew Book-
sellers in LONDON. 1714.

Price Six-Pence.

OXON. Octob. 13. 1714.

Imprimatur.

BERN. GARDINER,

Vice-Canc.



I
Do
W
all
tha
thi
So
fou
ha
ha
ha
thi
rig
on
he
be
the
ma
his
ture
and
all
he
dep
Ch
and
G n

THE P R E F A C E.

FEW Books, that have appear'd of late in the World, have made more noise in it, than that of Dr. Clarke's, entitled, *The Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*. The Reputation of the Writer and the Importance of the Subject, rais'd all Readers Expectations, and all good Men hoped that he had done as much service to Religion in this Performance, as He had done in some others. So that They were greatly surpris'd, when they found, that instead of *establisbing* Christianity, he had *attacqued* it in its *fundamental* Articles, and having promis'd a *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*, had given them the clean contrary, and done nothing more than revived *antiquated Errors*. He is right in that He asserts, the Scriptures to be the only Foundation of our Faith; and the Method he hath taken seems, as if He intended they should be the Foundation of His: But, upon perusal of the whole, it is very easy to perceive, that his main Endeavour is to accommodate the *Scriptures* to his own *Notions*, and not his *Notions* to the *Scriptures*. Had He taken his own good Advice [*Introduction*, pag. 3.] *i. e.* had he laid aside all *Vice* and all *Prejudice*, and made use of the best *Assistances* he might have procured, I dare say He had never departed from the Doctrine of the Catholick Church. Among these *Assistances*, the *Judgment* and *Direction* of the *living* Guides of the Church is none of the least. The Dr. hath had as great

The Preface.

Opportunities for this as any Man; whether He made any use of it, or not, I cannot say; I am sure he is Inexcusable, if he hath despised, or neglected it. Another Assistance is the *Writings* and *Monuments* of the Church, the Primitive especially. How He stands affected as to these, it is hard to say. If He approves of that Character of them, which he produceth from Mr. *Chillingworth*, viz. that *There are Councils against Councils, some Fathers against others, the same Fathers against themselves, a Consent of Fathers of one Age, against a Consent of Fathers of another Age, the Church of one Age against the Church of another Age, &c.* He must needs have but a mean Opinion of them. But then, To what purpose hath he spent so much Time and Pains about them? To what end is his Book stuff'd with so many Quotations out of them? For if such be their Character, What are they good for? And what use can there be made of them? It is manifest however, that He hath study'd them; so that He cannot be charged with the neglect of this Assistance, whatsoever it be. This is true indeed, it must be acknowledg'd, that he hath read the Fathers; but it may be said withal, that, according to his way of reading them, it is impossible they should be of use to him, tho' they were the best Books in the World. To render a Book useful to any Man, it is necessary, that He have a chief regard to the main *End* and *Design* of the *Writer*; and that, according to *this*, He interpret all the *particular Expressions*, if they are capable of being so interpreted. If any One appear inconsistent with it, He should look upon it as a *slip* of the Author's Pen, and not lay a greater stress upon *that*, than upon the *whole*.

But

The Preface.

But Dr. Clarke hath laid down a quite contrary Rule, viz. That particular Expressions are always so much the more to be depended upon, and the more to be regarded, as the Author, from whom they are cited, was upon the whole more different in his Opinion, from what those particular Citations seem to express. Reply, pag. 5. This He frequently insists upon, as the most proper method to know the Truth, and it is upon this Foundation that He lays the pertinency of most of his Citations. Now let us see of what use any Writer can be, according to this Rule. Novatian, the Dr. saith, how truly I shall not now enquire, is throughout of his Opinion, in denying a Community of Essence, or Substance in the Father and Son. Yet the same Novatian has one Sentence in which it is manifestly asserted. I will quote it presently in its own words. For It deserves the Dr's Consideration. He himself has quoted and transcribed great part of the Chapter in which it is; nay, the very next words, both above and below it, and besides, It hath been objected to Him, and yet He takes no notice of it. But, to return to my purpose, there is one Sentence, I say, in Novatian which asserts the Community of Essence in the Father and Son. Now I would ask the Dr. Whether We are to depend upon this one Sentence of Novatian's, for this Community of Essence in the Father and Son, against the Tenour of his whole Book, which (as the Dr. by mistake says) is to the contrary, or are we not? If he says we are not, What becomes of his Rule? If he says we are, Then we must believe the Father and Son to be of one Essence. Which if the Dr. allows of, we are in a very fair way to be agreed. Let us for once try the use of the Dr's own Book by this Rule. The Dr. doth

con-

The Preface.

constantly deny the *Son* to be the *God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob*; only in one place, He very deliberately asserts Him to be so. For He enumerates it among the highest *Titles ascribed* to Him, and proves it from the concurrent Testimony of the *Fathers*, v. *Scripture Doctr.* pag. 114. Now this falling, and in such a manner too, from the Dr. who every where else asserts the contrary, must, according to His own *Rule*, bear down all that he hath said to the contrary; and must be the *very Truth*, since it is the Concession of him who is in the whole of a *contrary Opinion*. Will the Dr. be pleas'd with this, and look on it as the most proper use of his Writings? I suppose that by this time the Dr. is weary of his own *Rule*. But if he still hath a fondness for it, and be resolved to maintain it, it is not worth while to dispute it with him: For it will serve our cause, and indeed any cause, as well as His, tho' none in truth to any purpose. I hope he will readily grant us thus much, *viz.* That in interpreting Writers, according to his *Rule*, *Men ought to take particular Sentences as they lie, and not to maim and mangle them, by taking in one bit, and leaving out another.* Now the Dr. I am sorry to say it, hath fail'd even in this particular. I shall here give You two Instances.

John X. 30. is alleged by *Catholick Writers*, both *ancient and modern*, for the *Unity of Essence* in both *Father and Son*. But the Dr. interprets it of *Unity in Power*, in opposition to *Unity of Essence*, and for the truth of his Interpretation quotes *St. Chrysostome* thus: *When our Lord says, I and my Father are one thing, he means One in Power; for concerning that [viz. concerning Power] was his whole Discourse.* [*Script. Doctrine*, page 100.] I need not add the

The Preface.

the *Original*, for this Translation happens to be just: Is it not clear then, that *St. Chrysostome* was with the Dr. for *Unity of Power*, in opposition to *Unity of Essence*? Read but the very next words, in which the Sense is continued by a *Conjunction*, and you'll find the direct contrary, εἰ δὲ ἡ δύναμις ἡ αὐτὴ, εὐδαλον ὅτι καὶ ἡ οὐσία. i. e. *and if the Power be the same, it is manifest the Essence must be so too.* v. *St. Chrysost.* Op. Tom. 2. page 812. l. 15. Ed. Savil. I think these words are too *material* to have been omitted by a *sincere* lover of Truth. But I forbear, and proceed to the other Instance. *Novatian* having, in his Book *De Trinitate*, proved the *Godhead* of the *Son*, as well as of the *Father*, closeth the whole with a Defence of his Doctrine from the Charge of *Polytheism*. And among other Expressions to that purpose hath this, *Unus Deus ostenditur verus & eternus Pater, a quo solo hac vis Divinitatis emissa & in Filium tradita & directa, rursus per Substantiæ communionem ad Patrem revolvitur.* i. e. *The Father is declared to be the One true and eternal God, from whom alone this Divinity being derived and communicated to the Son is return'd to the Father by a Communion of Substance.* The Dr. quotes this very Expression, and translates it so far as the word *emissa*, but there breaks off and skips over the Remainder, to the next Sentence. [*Christian Doctrine*, pag. 251.] Had he went fairly on, those words *Substantiæ communionem*, lying in the way, would have given him some trouble, and therefore He thought fit to leap over them; a miserable shift, and which He had never been put to, had he still kept him in the way of *Truth*. I hope the Dr. himself will consider it: And I leave it to his own Judgment, whether he hath herein acquitted himself as a Man, that, having laid aside all *Prejudice*,

The Preface.

'dice, sincerely sought the *Truth* himself, or desired to lead others into it.

I shall now proceed to an Examination of the Dr's *Doctrine of the Trinity*, and to that end shall consider every One of his Propositions. In which, whatsoever seems *true* I will freely *acknowledge*, what is *ambiguous* I will endeavour to *explain*, whatsoever is *false* I will *reject*. And I intend to carry my self throughout with that *Impartiality*, which becomes a *Servant* of the God of *Truth*. In so *great* and *sublime* a Subject, I may possibly fail, sometimes through *weakness* of Understanding, sometimes through *want* of Expression; but, by God's Grace, I never will through want of *Sincerity* and *Honesty* in my Heart. I shall take little or no notice of his Quotations out of the Fathers: For the Fathers, according to Him, are of no great moment in themselves, and his Quotations out of them cannot but think of much less. I am apt to think by what I have occasionally observ'd, that a *Thorough* Examination of them, together with his Translations, would prove but of small advantage, either to the Dr's Reputation, or that of his Cause. But that is a work I must leave to those, who have more *Books* to consult, and fewer *Cares* to interrupt their Studies.

17 00 65.

D

Dr. CLARKE's

Doctrine of the Trinity

Examined.

§. I.

THere is *One* Supreme Cause and Original of Things ;
One simple, uncompounded, undivided, intelligent
 Being, or Person ; who is the Author of all Being, and the
 Fountain of all Power.

THIS the Dr. saith is the first Principle of
 Natural Religion, and every where sup-
 posed in the Scripture Revelation: And
 truly it sounds much like it. But it is so perverted
 by the interposition of the word *Person*, that I do
 not see how it can be approved of, either by a Man
 of mere *Natural* Religion, or by any One that is
 well acquainted with *Reveal'd*. A Man of mere
natural Religion cannot approve of it, because the
 word *Person* being of no use, but to distinguish be-
 twixt *Individuals* of the same *nature*, He must needs
 think the Use of it absurd here, where he hath no
 Notion of *distinct individual Subsistences* in the same
Nature. Much less can One that is acquainted with
Reveal'd Religion approve of it. For how can he
 consent that the Description of the *Deity* should be
 restrain'd to *One Person* only, when he knows, that
 in the *Divine Nature*, there are no less than *Three* ?
 Well, but is not an *Intelligent Being* a *Person* ? Why,
 truly I believe there is no *Intelligent Being*, but
 B what

what is withal a *Person*. But yet *Intelligent Being* is far short of the adequate Definition of *Person*. For the Notion of a *Person* implies, that it be not only an *Intelligent Being*, but also that it *subsist by it self*, and be *distinguish'd from all other of the same nature by some incommunicable Properties*. For take away from an *Intelligent Being*, this peculiarity of *Subsistence*, with its *distinction by some incommunicable Properties*, and you destroy the Notion of its being a *Person*. Add them thereto, and the Notion returns. Whence it is manifest, that without them the Definition of a *Person* must be very imperfect. In the want of this Observation lies the Doctor's *fundamental Mistake*, which so perplexeth and confounds his Notions, that He cannot distinguish the Doctrine of the Church, *viz.* That *in the Unity of the Godhead there be Three Persons of one Essence*, from downright *Sabellianism*, *viz.* That all the Three *Persons* are but One *Person*.

It is farther said in this Proposition, that *God* is the *Author* of all *Being*. If by all *Being* the Dr. intended only all *created Being*, the Expression were proper enough: but since it appears by the References annex'd, that in all *Being* He includes the *Son* and *Holy Ghost* too, the Expression is *unscriptural* and *hard*. It seems to imply that *God* is the *Author* of *them*, as He is of all *other Being*, *i. e.* the *Creator* and *Maker*. But this is not the Doctor's meaning.

As for the Texts of Scripture He refers to, there is not One among all his 532, that asserts or implies the *Singularity* of *Person* in the *Divine Essence*. They tell us indeed, that there is but *One God*, and that the *Father* is that *One God*; but they no where say, that the *Father alone* is that *One God*.

With this *first* and supreme Cause, or Father of all Things, there has existed from the Beginning, a *second* Divine Person which is his Word or Son.

By the *first and supreme Cause*, or *Father of all Things*, the *first Person* in the *Trinity* is here intended, who is truly such. And the Dr. tho' mentioning him here in Contradistinction to the *Son*, chose to describe him not by his *personal*, but *essential* Attributes, that He might carry on his design of limiting the *Divine Essence* to the *Person* of the *Father*. But are these *Essential Attributes*? And can the *Son* also be stiled the *first and supreme Cause*, and *Father of all things*? I say, these are *Essential Attributes*, and belong to *God* as *God*, and consequently the *Son* being *very God*, they must belong to him. Besides, the Scripture says expressly of the *Son*, that *He in the beginning laid the Foundation of the Earth, and that the Heavens are the work of his hands*. Hebr. 1. 10. by *Heavens* and *Earth* are meant *all things*, so that the *Son* must be the *Cause* of all things, and if so, He must be the *first and supreme Cause*, for who ever reckon'd him among *second Causes*? And what Power less than *infinite* could make all things? And what Cause can be *prior* and *superior* to the *infinite*? But how should the *Son* be the *Father of all things*? Very consistently: for by *all things* we are to understand all *created things*, so that in saying the *Son* is *Father of all things*, we do not say He is the *Father of himself*. There is a vast difference betwixt being the *Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*, and being *Father of all things*. The *first* is an *incommunicable* Property of the *first Person* in the *Trinity*, who for this Reason especially is call'd *God the Father*, and most properly so, upon account of the most proper *Generation* of his only begotten *Son*. The *second* belongs to *God*, but *improperly* and *metaphori-*

phorically; for altho' He is stiled the *Father of all things*, because he gives *Being* to all things, he cannot be so stiled in a *proper and strict* Sense, since he doth not give it by *Generation*, but *Creation* only. Since therefore the *Son* thus gave *Being* to all things, He may be thus stiled *Father of all things*. I have insisted on this the more largely, because the Dr. seems, not only here, but in other parts of his Writings on this Subject, to take the *Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*, and the *Father of all things*, for *equivalent* Expressions. If to what I have here said it be objected, that the Title of *Maker of Heaven and Earth* is in the *Creed* attributed to the *Father*, and not to the *Son and Holy Ghost*. To this I might make a large Answer, but that One of Bp. Pearson's shall suffice. *viz.* 'That it was so attributed to him, '1. In respect of those *Heresies* which deny'd this 'Title to him. 2. In respect of the *Paternal Priority* 'in the *Deity*, by reason whereof, that which is 'common to the *Father, Son and Holy Ghost*, may be 'rather attributed to the *Father*, as the *first* Person 'in the *Trinity*. [v. Pearson on the *Creed*, pag. 65.] If Dr. Clarke be content that we should apply the Terms of *first and supreme Cause*, and *Father of all things*, in like manner to *God the Father*, i. e. not excluding the *Son and Holy Ghost*. This second Proposition thus understood is *true and orthodox*, and sufficiently proved by the *Texts of Scripture* he hath refer'd us to.

§. III.

With the Father and the Son, there has existed from the Beginning, a Third Divine Person, which is the Spirit of the Father and of the Son.

By the words *from the Beginning*, I understand in this, and in the foregoing Proposition, from all *Eternity*, as I hope the Dr. himself doth. And thus this Proposition is true, and the Texts, refer'd to, prove it.

§. IV.

What the proper Metaphysical *Nature, Essence, or Substance* of any of these Divine Persons is, the Scripture has no where at all declared; but describes and distinguishes them always, by their *Personal Characters, Offices, Powers and Attributes.*

I cannot but observe how the Dr. himself here makes a Distinction betwixt *Essence* and *Person* in the Divinity, in that he saith, the Scripture Describes the *Persons*, but not the *Essence*. A Distinction he sometimes seems to have no Notion of. As to the Proposition it self, I do not see how it is true. For the *Godhead* is the *Essence* of each; and what the *Nature of God* is the Scripture every where informs us by the Attributes of *Spirituality, Omnipotence, Omnipresence, Holiness*, and all manner of *infinite Perfection*. Nay, the main design of the Scripture seems to be the acquainting us with the *Nature of God*, and thereby the teaching us, what *Worship and Service* is agreeable to him. Had it fail'd in this, it had fail'd in the most *fundamental Point*. And therefore to say that it doth so, is a kind of *Blasphemy* against that *Holy Book*, and the *Revelation* therein contain'd; making it *darker* than the very *Book of Nature*, in which the *invisible things of God, from the Creation of the World, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal Power and Godhead.* Rom. i. 20. What moved the Dr. to lay down this Proposition I cannot conceive, unless it were his Apprehensions, that from the *Nature of God*, which is so fully reveal'd in Scripture, Men should deduce such *Reasons and Arguments* as would overthrow his *Hypothesis*.

§. V.

The *Father (or First Person) Alone* is *Self-existent, Unde-rived, Unoriginated, Independent; made of None, begotten of None, proceeding from None.*

Had that word *Alone* been left out of this Proposition I should have admitted it without any Scruple.
For

For every One of these *Attributes* do undoubtedly belong to the *Person* of the *Father*, as the Texts refer'd to do abundantly prove. But whereas it is here affirm'd, that the *Father alone* is *Independent*, and for the Proof of this we are refer'd to such Texts as stile him the *living God*; what is this but a *denial* of the *Son* and *Holy Ghost's* being the *living God*, and a reducing them to the State and Condition of mere *Creatures*, which in God *live and move, and have their Being*? Now I cannot frame any Notion of such a *dependent God*. And yet Dr. Clarke himself doth not stick to say, that the *Son* is *really and truly God*, and that by *Nature* too, as truly as *Man* is by *Nature* truly *Man*. [Reply to Mr. Nelson, pag. 50. 52. 81.] What? By *Nature* *really and truly God*, and yet *dependent*? It is a Contradiction in Terms. Besides, it is written, *John* 5. 26. that the *Son hath life in himself, as the Father hath life in himself*. But you will say, that it is by the Father's gift that he thus hath it. True, but if the gift be real, he *really* hath it, tho' by gift. But if he be still *dependent*, He hath not *life in himself*, contrary to what He himself asserts, and the *Gift* is but *fallacious and delusory*. Which surely it can never enter into any *Christian Heart* to think.

§. VI.

The *Father* (or *First Person*) is the *Sole Origin* of all *Power and Authority*, and is the *Author and Principle* of whatsoever is done by the *Son*, or by the *Spirit*.

This is true, for as much as the *Son* and *Holy Ghost* have the *Deity* it self *originally* from the *Father*.

§. VII.

The *Father* (or *First Person*) *Alone*, is in the highest, strict, and proper Sense, absolutely *Supreme* over *All*.

Supremacy over all is an *Attribute* of the *Deity* as such, and therefore ought not to be restrain'd to the

the *Person* of the *Father*. For the *Son* also is *over all, God blessed for ever*. Rom. 9. 5. But for as much as the *Deity* is in the *Father* originally, and the *Son* and *Holy Ghost* have it but by *communication* from Him, the Proposition may be true in the Sense express'd.

§. VIII.

The *Father* (or *First Person*) is, absolutely speaking, the *God of the Universe*; the *God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob*; the *God of Israel*; of *Moses, of the Prophets and Apostles*; and the *God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*.

If by *absolutely speaking* were here meant *speaking by way of Eminence* only, this Proposition would be absolutely true, and sufficiently proved by the *Texts* refer'd to. But as the Dr. explains himself in other places, we are to understand by *absolutely speaking*, speaking *exclusively* of both the other Persons. And in this Sense the Proposition is partly *true*, partly *false*. It is *true*, in asserting the *Father alone* to be the *God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*. It is *false*, in affirming Him *alone* to be *God of the Universe*, For the *Son* also is *over all, God blessed for ever*. Rom. 9. 5. The *Father* and *Son* have but *One Throne*. Rev. 22. 1, 3. He that is the *First* and the *Last* is the *only God*. Is. 44. 6. and the *Almighty*. Rev. 1. 8. Our *Saviour* is the *First* and the *Last*. Rev. 1. 17. Therefore is *one God* with the *Father*, and the *Almighty*, the Παντοκράτωρ, or *Supreme Governour*. He is also the *God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob*. The Doctor himself, in his *Scripture Doctrine*, Chap. 2. Sect. 3. reckons up this among the *Titles* ascribed to him. He says indeed withal, that it is ascribed to him as *personating the Father*. But if so, it must be spoken of the *Father*, and not of *him*; and, Why then doth he reckon it among *his Titles*? This is a little *Contradictory*. But that it truly belongs to Him is clear from *Gen. 28. 13.* compared with *Gen. 31. 11, 13. 31. 15, 16.* in which *Texts* it is ascribed to *Him*,
that

that is at the same time stiled the *Angel*, which, as the Dr. truly observes, the *Father* no where is. And from these Texts doth *Novatian* (whose Authority the Dr. sure will not except against) prove his *Divinity*. *De Trinitate*, Cap. 15. & 27. He is also the *God of Israel*. It is agreed on all Hands, that the *Father* never Personally appear'd to any Man, and yet *Moses*, and the *LXX Elders*, saw the *God of Israel*, *Exod.* 24. 9, 10. The *Son* therefore must be the *God of Israel*.

Lastly, He is the *God of the Prophets and Apostles*. For *Thomas*, who was One of them, said unto him, *My Lord, and my God*, *John* 20. 28. and He accepted the Title.

§. IX.

The Scripture, when it mentions the *One God*, or the *Only God*, always means the Supreme Person of the *Father*.

This Observation is not very material, and may be true, for ought I know. But the Dr's Reason for it I cannot approve of altogether. He says in his Note, It is because the *Father alone* is *absolutely Supreme, Self-existent, and Independent*, which are *Personal Characters*, and evidently *impossible to be communicated* from one Person to another. That *absolute Supremacy, and Independency* are not *Personal Characters*, but *Essential*, belonging to *God as God*. I have already proved §. II. V. *Self-existency* is indeed a *Personal Character*, and the *Father alone* is *Self-existent*, having received his *Being* from no other, whereas the *Son* and *Holy Ghost* derive theirs from the *Father*. Upon this account, The *Father* may be stiled *God*, the *One and Only God*, by way of *Eminency*.

§. X.

Whenever the Word, *God*, is mention'd in Scripture, with any High *Epithet, Title* or *Attribute* annex'd to it; it generally (if not always) means the *Person* of the *Father*.

It may generally, but it doth not always, so mean

see *Rom. 9. 5. Hebr. 1. 8.* But it matters not much, whether it do or not.

§. XI.

The Scripture when it mentions GOD, absolutely and by way of Eminence, always means the *Person* of the *Father*.

It doth very *often* so mean; but that it *always* doth so, is more than can be proved.

§. XII.

The *Son* (or *Second Person*) is not *Self-existent*, but derives his *Being* or *Essence*, and all his *Attributes* from the *Father*, as from the *Supreme Cause*.

By *Attributes* here, I suppose the Dr. means *Essential* Attributes, for the Son hath some *Personal* Attributes, which arise from his own *Personal* Actions, such as are, *Saviour*, *Redeemer*, and the like. The Proposition understood of the *Former* is true: For these, together with his *Essence*, are derived from the *Father*. The Dr. need not have added, as from the *Supreme Cause*, for these words are ordinarily understood of *God*, in relation to *Creatures*, and *second, inferior* Causes. So that they may be construed in a worse Sense than, I am perswaded, the Dr. intended; tho', to speak the Truth, I very much fear, He intended no very good one. If these words were struck out, the Proposition would be altogether unexceptionable; for it is well proved by the Scriptures refer'd to; only the last, Numb. 992, seems nothing to the purpose.

§. XIII.

In what *particular Metaphysical Manner* the *Son* derives his *Being* or *Essence* from the *Father*, the Scripture has no where distinctly declared; and therefore Men ought not to presume to be able to define.

The Scripture speaks of his *Generation*, stiles him the *Son*, and *only begotten* of the *Father*: So that it seems it was by *Generation* that He received his *Being*, but a *Generation* of so *transcendent* a nature, that We can form no proper and distinct Notion of it.

They are therefore equally worthy of Censure; who either on the one hand presume to affirm, that the Son was made (ἐκ οὐτῶν) out of Nothing; or on the other hand, that He is the *self-existent Substance*.

If by *self-existent Substance* the Dr. means the *Person* of the *Father*, all is right; but if thereby He means *God* absolutely, He himself deserves Censure for denying the *Son* to be *God*.

I desire here that it may be observed, in *justice* to the Dr. that He is not a rank *Arian*, since he condemns those who say the *Son* was made ἐκ οὐτῶν .

§. XV.

The Scripture, in declaring the *Son's Derivation* from the Father, never makes mention of any limitation of *Time*; but always supposes and affirms him, to have existed with the Father *from the Beginning*, and *before all Worlds*.

This is true, and sufficiently proved by the *Texts* refer'd to. But the Proposition had been more complete, had it been closed with, *i. e. from all Eternity*, as I hope the Dr. means.

§. XVI.

They therefore have also justly been censured; who pretending to be wise above what is written, and intruding into things which they have not seen; have presumed to affirm [ὅτι ἦν ὅτε ἐκ ἡν] that there was a time when the Son was not.

They were justly Censured for their *Error*, as well as their *Presumption*. I must here do Justice again to the Dr. and vindicate him from the Charge of perfect *Arianism*, for ἦν ὅτε ἐκ ἡν was the *Shibboleth* of *Arius's Party*.

§. XVII.

Whether the Son derives his Being from the Father, by *Necessity of Nature*, or by the *Power of his Will*, the Scripture hath no where expressly declared.

I add, They therefore deserve to be Censured, who in this matter pretend to be wise above what is written, and intruding into things which they have not seen, are *positive* and *decisive* on either side

of the Question. For my part I look on it as a *fruitless and presumptuous Enquiry.*

§. XVIII.

The [*Λόγος*, the] *Word* or *Son* of the Father, sent into the World to assume our Flesh, and die for the Sins of Mankind; was not the [*λόγος ἐνδιάθετος*, the] *internal Reason* or *Wisdom* of God, an *Attribute* or *Power* of the Father; but a *real Person*, the same who from the Beginning had been the *Word*, or *Revealer of the Will*, of the Father to the World.

I believe there is an higher Reason for the *Son's* being stiled the *Λόγος* or *Word*, than that which is here mention'd, *viz.* his *Revealing the Will of the Father to the World.* However, I shall not insist upon it. This Proposition is true, and well enough proved.

§. XIX.

The *Holy Spirit* (or *Third Person*) is not *Self-existent*, but derives his *Being* or *Essence* from the *Father* (by the *Son*) as from the *Supreme Cause.*

The Proposition had been more agreeable to the Language of the *Church of England*, if the Dr. had written, *from the Father and the Son.* But I insist not upon Niceties. I have the same Scruple, with regard to *supreme Cause*, in this Proposition as in §. XII. but nothing farther to object to it; for the Substance of it is sufficiently proved.

§. XX.

The Scripture, speaking of the *Spirit of God*, never mentions any Limitation of *Time*, when He derived his *Being* or *Essence* from the Father; but supposes Him to have existed with the Father from the Beginning.

This Proposition is true.

§. XXI.

In what particular metaphysical Manner, the *Holy Spirit* derives his *Being* from the Father, the Scripture hath no where at all defined, and therefore Men ought not to presume to be able to explain.

That He derives his *Being* in a different manner from what the *Son* doth, is manifest, for else He

would be a *Son* too. The Scripture saith it is by *Procession*, but of this We are not able to form a *just* and *adequate* Notion; and so far this Proposition is true.

§. XXII.

The Holy Spirit does not in Scripture generally signify a mere *Power* or *Operation* of the Father, but a *real Person*.

I do not know, that It *any where* signifies a mere *Power*, or *Operation* of the *Father*. It is often used for the *Operations* and *Gifts* of the *Holy Spirit* it self. However, this Proposition is true, and well proved.

§. XXIII.

They who are not careful to maintain these *personal* Characters and Distinctions, but while they are solicitous (on the one hand) to avoid the Errors of the *Arians*, affirm (in the contrary extreme) the *Son* and *Holy Spirit* to be (*individually* with the Father) the *Self-existent Being*: These, seeming in Words to magnify the Name of the *Son* and *Holy Spirit*, in reality take away their very Existence, and so fall unawares into *Sabellianism* (which is the same with *Socinianism*.)

By the *self-existent Being* here the Dr. understands the *Person* of the *Father*, see §. I. and truly they that thus confound the *Persons*, err most horribly, and he may charge this Error as home as He pleases. I think no true *Son* of the *Church of England* is in the least concern'd to defend it. For we are careful to maintain all the *personal* Characters, and thereby to distinguish the *Persons*, tho' we are at the same time as careful to maintain the *Unity* of *Essence*. Thus (to use the Words of the *Constantinopolitan Fathers*, in their Synodical Epistle written A.D. 382) 'do we maintain the most *Ancient* Faith, conformable to our *Baptism*, and teaching us to believe in 'the Name of the *Father*, and of the *Son* and *Holy Ghost*: So that whilst we believe the *One Deity*, 'Power and *Essence* of the *Father*, *Son* and *Holy Ghost*, 'together with the *equal Dignity*, and co-*eternal Majesty* in three perfect *Persons*. There is no room 'for

for the Contagion of *Sabellius*, by a confusion of Persons, or destruction of Properties; nor can the Blasphemy of the *Eunomians*, *Arians*, and **Pneumatomachi* (* i. e. such as deny'd the Deity of the Holy Ghost) prevail, by dividing the *Essence*, *Nature* and *Godhead*, or by introducing another Nature, either created, or differing in *Essence*, and posterior to the *uncreated*, *co-essential* and *co-eternal* Trinity. See *Theodorit Eccl. Hist.* l. 5. c. 9. I wish the Dr. may be as cautious to avoid the Errors on the one hand, as he advises us to be on the other.

§. XXIV.

The Word *God*, in the New Testament, sometimes signifies the Person of the *Son*.

This is true, as appears from the *Texts* refer'd to.

§. XXV.

The reason why the *Son*, in the New Testament, is sometimes stiled *God*, is not so much upon the Account of his *Metaphysical Substance*, how *Divine* soever: as of his *relative Attributes*, and *Divine Authority* over Us.

This Proposition is *dubiously* express'd. For it is said here, that the *Son* is stiled *God*, not so much upon the Account of his Substance. Is he so stiled upon this Account at all? Not so much seems to imply that he is a little. But the Dr. allows not so much as this: For He asserts, that the word *God* has in Scripture only a *relative* Signification, not an *absolute* one. [See his *Answer* to the Author of *Some Considerations*, pag. 284. 290.] *God* then, in the Scriptural Sense of the word, could not be *God* before the Creation, because there was nothing then to which He could be related. And yet the Scripture says, from *everlasting* to *everlasting* Thou art *God*, *Pf.* 90. 2. This is a *singular* Observation of the Dr's: But why, I pray, did He not make the same in relation to the *Father* too? It is not worth while to dispute with him about it, since he grants the *Son* to be

be stiled *God* upon the account of his *relative* Attributes. For this necessarily implies his being *God* by *Nature*, and in *Substance*. For were He not *truly God* in this *latter* Sense, it is impossible He should be so in the *former*.

§. XXVI.

By the Operation of the *Son*, the Father both Made and Governs the World.

This is true, and well proved.

§. XXVII.

Concerning the *Son*, there are Other the *greatest* Things spoken in Scripture, and the *Highest* Titles ascribed to Him; even such as include *All Divine Powers*, excepting absolute *Supremacy* and *Independency*, which to suppose *Communicable* is an Express Contradiction in Terms.

Then it seems We must look upon the *Son* as only an *inferior* and *dependent God*, that is, *no God* at all. For *absolute Supremacy* and *Independency* are included in the very *notion* of *God*. As for the *Contradiction* the Dr. talks of, I see not where it lies, as *express* as it is. That *absolute Supremacy* and *Independency* should be *communicated*, without a *communication* of the *Essence*, from which they are inseparable, were indeed a *Contradiction*. But where the very *Essence*, to which they belong, is *communicated*, as in the present case, to say They also are *communicated*, is so far from being a *Contradiction*, that I am sure it is *one*, to say they are not.

§. XXVIII.

The *Holy Spirit* is described in the new Testament, as the immediate *Author* and *Worker* of all *Miracles*, even of those done by our *Lord himself*; and as the *Conduiter* of *Christ* in all the *Actions* of his *Life*, during his State of *Humiliation* here upon *Earth*.

I don't know of any *Objection*, that can justly be made to this.

§. XXIX.

The *Holy Spirit* is declared in Scripture to be the *Inspirer* of the *Prophets* and *Apostles*, and the *Great Teacher* and *Director* of the *Apostles* in the whole *Work* of their *Ministry*.

This is true.

§. XXX.

§. XXX.

The *Holy Spirit* is represented in the New Testament, as the *Sanctifier* of all Hearts, and the *Supporter* and *Comforter* of good Christians under all their Difficulties.

This is true.

§. XXXI.

Concerning the *Holy Spirit* there are Other Greater Things spoken in Scripture, and Higher Titles ascribed to him, than to any *Angel* or other Created Being whatsoever.

This is very true; even things which signify his being *God*, as appears from the *Texts* refer'd to.

§. XXXII.

The word, *God*, in Scripture, no where signifies the *Holy Ghost*.

That is, the *Holy Ghost* is not in express words stiled *God*. And yet *God*, in *Acts* 5. 4. is by most *Orthodox* Writers understood of the *Holy Ghost*. But the Dr. labours, together with the *Socinians*, to set aside that Interpretation. But yet against the ordinary *Rule* of Interpretation, which is, to understand Texts in their *literal* Sense, where there is no cogent Reason against it, as, I am sure, there is none here. For what should hinder *His* being stiled *God*, who hath the *Attributes* of *God* ascribed to Him?

§. XXXIII.

The word, *God*, in Scripture, never signifies a complex Notion of more Persons than One; but always means One Person only, viz. either the Person of the *Father* singly, or the Person of the *Son* singly.

I see no just grounds for this Assertion. For the word, *God*, is often used in Scripture, without any particular respect to either of the Persons.

§. XXXIV.

The *Son*, whatever his metaphysical Essence or Substance be, and whatever divine Greatness and Dignity is ascribed to him in Scripture; yet in This He is evidently Subordinate to the *Father*, that He derives his Being and Attributes from the *Father*, the *Father* Nothing from Him.

This Subordination is allow'd.

§. XXXV.

§. XXXV.

Every Action of the Son, both in *making the World*; and in all other his *Operations*; is only the Exercise of the *Father's Power*, communicated to him after an ineffable manner.

This Proposition is very *ambiguous*. If by the *Father's Power*, be here meant *Power originally* derived from the Father, it is very true. But if *Father's Power* be so understood, as that the Son should have no *Power* of his own to exercise, it is *false* and *absurd*. It is *false*, in that it contradicts the Scriptures, particularly *John* 10. 18. 17. 2. 2 *Cor.* 12. 9. *Rev.* 5. 13. and almost innumerable others: It is *absurd*, for it supposes *Power communicated*, and yet not *his* to whom it is *communicated*, i. e. *communicated* and not *communicated*.

§. XXXVI.

The Son, whatever his *Metaphysical Nature* or *Essence* be; yet, in this whole *Dispensation*, in the *Creation* and *Redemption* of the World, acts in all things according to the *Will*, and by the *Mission* or *Authority* of the Father.

I see no reason to object against This.

§. XXXVII.

The Son, how great soever the metaphysical Dignity of his Nature was, yet in the whole *Dispensation* entirely directed all his Actions to the *Glory* of the Father.

If by *entirely* here, we are to understand *exclusively* of his own *Glory*, I cannot see how this Proposition can be true, since the *Glory* of both *Father* and *Son* are so united, that *He that* honoureth *not the Son*, honoureth *not the Father*. *John* 5. 23.

§. XXXVIII.

Our Saviour, Jesus Christ, as, before his *Incarnation*, he was sent forth by the *Will* and good *Pleasure*, and with the *Authority* of the Father; so in the *Flesh*, both before and after his *Exaltation*, notwithstanding that the *Divinity* of the Son was personally and inseparably united to it, he, in acknowledgment of the *Supremacy* of the Person of the Father, always *prayed* to Him, and returned Him *Thanks*, styling Him *his God*, &c.

Christ by his *Incarnation* became truly *Man*. And thus

thus being in all things, Sin only excepted, made like unto us; He could not but acknowledge his *Father's Supremacy*, and behave himself in all respects as became *Man to God*. So that this Proposition must needs be true.

§. XXXIX.

The reason why the Scripture, though it stiles the *Father* God, and also stiles the *Son* God, yet at the same time always declares there is but *One God*, is, because in the *Monarchy* of the Universe, there is but *one Authority*, original in the *Father*, derivative in the *Son*: The *Power of the Son* being, not *Another Power* opposite to that of the *Father*, nor *Another Power co-ordinate* to that of the *Father*; but it self *The Power and Authority of the Father*, communicated to, manifested in, and exercised by the *Son*.

The Dr. tho' pretending to give us nothing but *Scripture-Doctrine*, and to deduce these Propositions as so many *Conclusions* from *Scripture-Premises*, has ventured here to lay down a Proposition of the greatest *Weight* and *Moment*, for which He hath not one *Text* of *Scripture* to allege, no not so much as for a colour and pretence, notwithstanding his singular *dexterity* in forcing of *Texts* to serve his Purposes. He only refers us to §. IX. from whence we are refer'd back again to this. Thus doth he reel to and fro, and stagger— where he ought to have had the *firmest* Footing. For, surely a Man ought to have good Ground there, where he pretends to raise an *Hypothesis* so weighty, as to account for the *Unity* of the Godhead in a *Plurality* of Persons. But You will say, He hath supplied the want of *Scripture*, by an abundance of *Quotations* out of the *Fathers*. That is by *Authorities* which He himself saith [*Introduct.* pag. 17.] are no *Proofs*, nor by him alleged as such, but as *Illustrations* only. Besides, tho' I have a more honourable Opinion of the *Fathers* than Dr. *Clarke* hath, yet I have no great confidence in his *Citations* out of them. The Reasons why I have not, I have given in the Preface: And this is all I

D

need

need say to this Proposition. I shall only add, that how much soever the Dr. design'd to have served himself in it, It makes directly against him: For if the Son be *one God* with the *Father*, because he hath one and the same *Dominion* and *Power* with the *Father*, He must be *One in Essence* with the *Father*, Who hath solemnly declared, that *He will not give his Glory to another*. If. 42. 8. 48. 11. *His Glory*, that is, *his Honour*, which (according to the Dr. himself §. LI.) is founded on his *Dominion* and *Power*.

§. XL.

The *Holy Spirit*, whatever his Metaphysical Nature, Essence, or Substance be; and whatever divine Power or Dignity is ascribed to him in Scripture; yet in this He is evidently *subordinate* to the Father; that He derives his Being and Powers from the Father, the Father nothing from Him.

This Subordination is granted.

§. XLI.

The *Holy Spirit*, whatever his Metaphysical Nature, Essence or Substance be; and whatever divine Power or Dignity is ascribed to him in Scripture; yet in the whole Dispensation of the Gospel, always acts *by the Will of the Father*, is given and sent by him, intercedes to him, &c.

This Proposition is true, but we must so understand it, as to acknowledge withal, that he distributes his *Gifts* according to his own Will. 1 Cor. 12. 11.

§. XLII.

The *Holy Spirit*, as he is *subordinate* to the Father; so he is also in Scripture represented as *subordinate* to the Son, both by Nature, and by the Will of the Father; excepting only that he is described as being the Conduſter and Guide of our Lord, during his State of Humiliation here upon Earth.

If by *Nature* in this Proposition be understood *Essence* or *Substance*, it is false; for this *Subordination* of Persons in the Trinity, ariseth only from their *Personal Relations*, not from any *distinction* in their *Essence*. For the *Essence* is one and the same in all the *three* Persons, they all being *One* and the *same* God,

God, and it is impossible that the same *Essence* should be *Subordinate* to it self. But if by *Nature* be meant his *Personal Character*, as he is the *third* Person proceeding from the other two; in this Sense the Proposition is true.

§. XLIII.

Upon these Grounds, *absolutely Supreme Honour* is due to the Person of the *Father* singly, as being alone the *Supreme Author* of all Being and Power.

If by *Supreme Honour* be here meant an acknowledgment, that the *Father alone* is the *first* Person in the *Godhead*, *self-existent* and *unoriginated*, whereas the *Son* and *Holy Ghost* derive their *Being* from Him; This *Honour* the Church always hath, and always will pay Him. But if by *absolutely supreme Honour*, be understood, *that Religious Worship* which is to be paid to *God*, with *all our Hearts*, *all our Minds*, *all our Souls*, and *all our Strength*, we cannot give more Honour to the *Father*, than we are bound to do to the *Son* and *Holy Ghost*, for *all* this Honour is due to each *Person* of the *Trinity* upon the account of that *Godhead*, which He hath together with the other two; neither is this *Worship* to be divided any more than the *Godhead* it self. Tho' the Dr. by alleging, in proof of this Proposition, that Text, *Luke 4. 8. Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve*, and restraining it to the *Person* of the *Father*, doth utterly *exclude* the *Son* and *Holy Ghost*, from all kind of *Religious Worship*.

§. XLIV.

For the same Reason, All *Prayers* and *Praises* ought *primarily* or *ultimately* to be directed to the Person of the *Father*, as the *Original* and *Primary Author* of all Good.

If I mistake not the sense of this Proposition; the *Son* and *Holy Ghost*, according to it, can be only *Mediums* of *Worship* to the *Father*. Which the Texts refer'd to are far from proving, and by several others we are assured of the contrary: see the *2 Pet. 3. 18.*

Rev. 1. 6. §. 12, 13, in which the *highest* Acts of *Adoration* and *Praise* are address'd to the *Person* of the *Son*, and terminated in *him*, as well as in the *Father*. In short, it matters not to which of the *Persons* our *Religious Addresses* are made, for in Honouring *one* We Honour the *other*.

§. XLV.

And upon the same Account, whatever Honour is paid to the *Son* who redeem'd, or to the *Holy Spirit* who sanctifies us, must always be understood as tending finally to the Honour and Glory of the *Father*, by whose good pleasure the *Son* redeem'd, and the *Holy Spirit* sanctifies us.

The Honour paid to the *Son* and *Holy Ghost*, must necessarily tend to the Honour and Glory of the *Father*, since from *Him* they derive that *Essence* upon the account of which they are Honour'd and Glorify'd by us. Not but that *they* are in themselves *admirable*, and there is no necessity, that in our *Adoration* of them, we should have an *actual* and *explicit* Intention to glorify the *Father* by them. Not the *personal Relations* they stand in to each other, but the *Deity*, which is in them all, renders *every One* of them the *Object* of the *highest* Honour We can pay. Were it otherwise, We might Worship that which is not *God*. This Proposition nevertheless, if consider'd by it self, and as *candidly* interpreted, as the words will bear, has nothing scandalous or offensive in it.

§. XLVI.

For, the *Great Oeconomy*, or the whole Dispensation of God towards Mankind in Christ, consists and terminates in This; that as all *Authority and Power* is originally in the *Father*, and from him derived to the *Son*, and exercised according to the *Will of the Father*, by the *Operation of the Son*, and by the *Energy of the Holy Spirit*; and all Communications from God to the *Creature*, are convey'd thro' the *Intercession* of the *Son*, and by the *Inspiration and Sanctification* of the *Holy Spirit*: So on the contrary, *All Returns* from the *Creature*, of *Prayers and Praises*, of *Reconciliation and Obedience*, of *Honour and Duty* to God; are made in and by the *Guidance and Assistance of the Holy Spirit*, thro' the *Mediation of the Son*, to the *Supreme Father and Author of all things*. This

This seems to signifie that We are not to pay any *divine Worship* to the *Son* and *Holy Ghost*, but only, *in and through* them, to the *Person* of the *Father*. If it doth so, it is undoubtedly *false*: If it doth not, I see no considerable *Objection* that lies against it.

§. XLVII.

The *Son* before his *Incarnation*, was with *God*, was in the *Form* of *God*, and had *Glory* with the *Father*.

Not only *before* his *Incarnation*, but even from all *Eternity*, and *before the World* was, *John* 1. 1. 17. 5. He was with *God* and was *God* from all *Eternity*. From whence I conclude that the *Word*, *God*, in *Scripture*, is an *Absolute* Term denoting the *Essence* of *God*, and not merely *relative*, denoting only *Dominion* and *Authority* over the *Works* of the *Creation*, as the *Dr.* would have it.

§. XLVIII.

Yet He had not then *distinct Worship* paid to him in his own *Person*, but appear'd only as the [*Shecinah* or] *Habitation* of the *Glory* of the *Father*, in which the *Name* of *God* was: The *Distinctness* and *Dignity* of his *Person*, and the true *Nature* of his *Authority* and *Kingdom*, not being yet reveal'd.

The *Texts*, refer'd to, prove nothing of this. On the contrary, it is clear, that He had *distinct Worship* paid to him *before* his *Incarnation*. For *Jacob* Worship'd him at *Bethel*, *Gen.* 28. 13. 31. 11, 13. and *blessed* *Ephraim* and *Manasses* in *His Name*, *Gen.* 48. 15, 16. (v. §. VIII.) and at the same time by laying his *Hands* a-cross upon the *Children's Heads*, (as *Novatian* says, *De Trin.* c. 15. 27.) prefigured *His Passion*. *David* requires *Men* to *reverence* him, and pronounces a *Blessing* to all them that put their *Trust* in Him. *Psal.* 2. 12. In *Isaiab*, ch. 6. He is represented as sitting upon a *Throne*, with *Seraphims* above it, *adoring* Him. For *St. John* lays expressly, that the *Prophet* here saw the *Glory* of *Christ*, and spake of *Him*, *John* 12. 41. Again, the same *Prophet*

phet says concerning him, c. 8. 13. *Sanctify the Lord of Hosts himself, and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread.* This *Lord of Hosts* is the same with *Him*, of whom in the next Verse it is said, that *He shall be for a Stone of stumbling, and for a Rock of offence to both the Houses of Israel.* Which *Stone* and *Rock* is *Christ*, as appears from *Luke 2. 34. Rom. 9. 33.* From all which it appears, that the *Distinctness* and *Dignity* of his *Person* were known under the *Old Testament*, though not so perfectly as under the *New*.

§. XLIX.

At his Incarnation He emptied Himself (*ἐκένωσεν ἑαυτὸν*) of That Glory, which he had with God before the World was, and by vertue of which He is described, as having been in the *Form of God*; And in this State of Humiliation, suffered and died for the Sins of the World.

In this Proposition it is asserted, that our Saviour at his Incarnation emptied Himself of the *Form of God*. Now most orthodox Writers, by being in the *Form of God*, *Phil. 2. 6.* (which is the *Text* the Dr. refers to) understand being *very God*; as, in the next Verse, the *form of a Servant* signifies his being a *very Servant*, i. e. *very Man*. If then at his Incarnation He really emptied himself of the *Form of God*, He ceased to be God: A gross Absurdity. Our Translators therefore have well render'd *ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν*, *He made himself of no reputation*, and thus the word signifies *1 Cor. 1. 17.* *ἵνα μὴ κενωθῇ ὁ σταυρὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ. ἵνα μὴ βλάβῃ καὶ ἐλαττωσιν ὑπομείνη ὁ σταυρὸς.* *lest the Cross should sustain any damage and diminution.* Oecumen. in locum. But for a fuller Explanation of this Text, *Phil. 2. 6.* See Bp. Pearson on the Creed, pag. 121. In which He indeed translates *ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν*, *he emptied himself*: But by the Tenour of the whole Discourse it is plain, that He thereby meant no more than is express'd in our common Translation: Whereas Dr. Clarke supposes, that our Saviour at his Incarnation, actually

actually divested even his *Divine Nature* of its *Original Glory*. A thing absurd and impossible.

§. L.

After the Accomplishment of which Dispensation, He is described in Scripture as invested with *distinct Worship* in his *Own Person*; his *original Glory and Dignity* being at the same time reveal'd, and his *Exaltation* in the Human Nature to his *Mediatorial Kingdom* declared: Himself *sitting upon his Father's Throne*, at the Right-hand of the Majesty of God; and receiving *Prayers and Thanksgivings* from his Church.

To this I think nothing can be objected; but that He was distinctly Worship'd before the Accomplishment of this Dispensation. See *Mat. 14. 33. John 9. 38, &c.* See also §. XLVIII.

§. LI.

This Honour, the Scripture directs to be paid to Christ; not so much upon Account of his *metaphysical Essence*, or *Substance*, and *abstract Attributes*; as of his *Actions and Attributes relative to Us*; his *Condescension* in becoming *Man*, who was the *Son of God*; his *Redeeming*, and *Interceding for Us*; his *Authority, Power, Dominion*, and *Sitting upon the Throne of God his Father*, as our *Law-giver*, our *King*, our *Judge*, and our *God*.

In this Section the Dr. minces his Meaning: For here He only says, that *Honour* is to be paid to *Christ*, not so much upon Account of his *metaphysical Essence, &c.* He would have said, *not at all*, had he spoken out: For in his Notes he plainly says, that *Honour* is not due to the *abstract metaphysical Nature, Essence, or Substance*, but to the *Person intelligent*, as having *Dignity, Power, Authority, and Goodness*. And He applies this Maxim to every One of the Persons in the *Trinity*, even to the *Father* himself. But whence, I pray, has any One of these Persons, the *Father* for Instance, these *adorable Attributes*: Has He them not by *Nature*, are they not the inseparable Attendants of his *Essence*, or rather his *Essence* it self? Is He not then to be Honour'd upon the account of his *Nature and Essence*? This is a most *unaccountable* Position; And I cannot but observe here, how

how *nicely* the Dr. can distinguish betwixt *Essence* and *Person*, when it is to serve his own *Fancy* and *Imagination*; tho' He seems a Man of the *dullest* Apprehension in the World, when the same *Distinction* is used in behalf of the *Catholick Doctrine*. But, in Answer to this Position of the Dr's, I think I may safely lay down another, *viz.* No Actions, or Attributes of any Person, however Relative to Us, or how highly soever beneficial to Us, can render that Person the Object of our Religious Worship, unless the same Person be Adorable upon the Account of his Nature and Essence. Were it otherwise, There could be no Reason given, why the *Angel* should refuse the *Worship* which St. *John* would have paid him, *Rev.* 19. 10. 22. 9. or St. *Peter* that of *Cornelius*, *Acts* 10. 25, 26. Were I to write in Defense of the *Worship* of *Saints* and *Angels*, I should desire no greater an Advantage of my Adversary, than his granting me this Position of the Dr's: But far am I from thinking, that the Dr. had herein any Design to serve that Cause. No. I am perswaded, He had no other Intention in it than to obviate a very plain and forcible Argument which is usually brought for the Deity of the Son and Holy Ghost, from the *Worship* that is due to them, which bore so hard upon his Mind, that wanting something wherewith to fence against it, He hammered out this Position.

§. LII.

The Honour paid in this manner to the Son, must (as before) always be understood as redounding ultimately to the Glory of God the Father.

See §. XLV.

§. LIII.

The Honour which Christians are bound to pay peculiarly to the Person of the *Holy Spirit*, is express'd in these Texts following; Wherein we are directed, either by Precept, or by Example, to Baptize in his Name, *Matt.* 28. 19. To wish Grace, and Peace, and Blessing from him, *2 Cor.* 13, 14. *Rev.* 1. 4.

To appeal to him as Witness in solemn Affirmations, Rom. 9. 1.
15. 30. To take heed not to resist him. Acts 7. 51. 1 Thes. 5. 19.
not to do despite to him, Heb. 10. 29. not to tempt him, Acts 5. 9.
not to grieve him, Eph. 4. 30.

From all which I most certainly conclude, that
the *Holy Spirit* is *God*.

§. LIV.

For putting up *Prayers and Supplications* directly and expressly to the *Person of the Holy Spirit*, it must be acknowledged there is no clear *Precept or Example* in Scripture.

But to *wish Grace, and Peace, and Blessing from him*, is the same thing in effect. The Dr. adds, in his Note upon this Proposition, that the same must be confess'd concerning the *Practice* of the *Primitive Church* in the three first Centuries, so far as appears from the remaining Writings of those Ages. But yet it appears from the remaining Writings of those Ages, that the *Primitive Church* worship'd him, together with the *Father*, and the *Son*, Εὐχόμενοι τε καὶ προσκυνοῦμεν αὐτῷ καὶ τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῷ υἱῷ, πνεῦμά τε τὸ ὑπερσπουδαζόμενον καὶ προσκυνοῦμεν· saith *Justin Martyr*, Apol. I. c. 6. *We worship and adore Him [i. e. the Father] and the Son, and the Prophetick Spirit.*

§. LV.

The Titles given in the New Testament, to the *Three Persons* of the ever-blessed *Trinity*, when all mentioned together, are as follows, &c.

In this the Dr. is, for ought I perceive, very exact.

Thus have I seriously Perused and Examined the Dr's *Doctrine of the Trinity*, as it lies in his Propositions. And here I shall stop; leaving the Third Part of his Book for their Entertainment, who have much *leisure*, and delight to see how far a good Wit may go in *reconciling Contradictions*, when urged and spur'd on by *strong* and *prevailing* Motives. For my part I openly declare, I never met with so *extravagant* an Undertaking, as that of his Second Chapter,

in my Life, unless it were that of *S. Clara*, to reconcile our XXXIX Articles to the *Doctrines* and *Practices* of the *Church of Rome*. But as the One carried its own Confutation in its Bowels, so doth the Other; and will in a short time be the Ruine of it self. And I doubt not, but this whole Scheme of the Dr's will undergo the same Fate. It was advanced by the *Semi-Arians* above 1300 Years ago, and the *Truth* overthrew it. Whatsoever *Wit* and *Learning* may be abused for its support, it will most certainly fall: For when all is done, it is but the *De-vice* and *Work* of *Man*, and must come to nought.

SOME

SOME
REMARKS
ON

Dr. Clarke's Sentiments, &c.

SINCE the writing of this, there hath appear'd a Paper entitled, *Dr. Clarke's Sentiments concerning the Eternal Generation of the Son, and Process of the Holy Spirit, together with his Reasons for Writing and Preaching on the Trinity, as deliver'd to a Committee of the Upper-House of Convocation.* In which We have his Opinion of the Eternity of the Son and Holy Spirit, drawn up in some very peculiar and suspicious Terms. His words are these: *My opinion is, That the Son of God was eternally begotten by the Eternal Incomprehensible Power and Will of the Father; and that the Holy Spirit was likewise Eternally Derived from the Father, by, or through the Son, according to the Eternal Incomprehensible Power and Will of the Father.* Comparing this with other of the Dr's Writings, I take his meaning in these words, *the Son was begotten by the Power and Will of the Father*, to stand in opposition to His being begotten by the Father, by necessity of the divine Nature. Concerning which, see §. 17. above. But, What Authority of Scripture hath He for so positive a decision of this Point? I know of none that He pretends to, but *John 5. 26.* wherein it is said, that the *Father hath given to the Son to have life in himself*; which yet doth not come up to the Dr's purpose. We say, that the Sun in the Fir-

mament gives Light and Heat, which yet flow from it by the necessity of its Nature. To say, that the Son of God exists by the mere *arbitrary Will* and *Power* of the *Father*, is to say, that the Father, if He had so pleas'd, might have *forborn* the *Generation* of Him; which tho' it comes not quite up to the Blasphemy of *Arius*, in asserting, *There was a time when the Son was not*, yet falls not very short of it, in implying, that *There was a time when He might never have been*. Whereas it is highly probable at least, that, since the *divine Nature* exists in three Persons, it is a *Perfection* in it, *so* to exist; and if a *Perfection*, it must be *necessary*: For all *Perfection* is *necessary* to the *Divine Nature*. Concerning the *Holy Spirit*, it is here said, that *He was eternally derived from the Father, by, or through, the Son, according to the Power and Will of the Father*. And, Why not according to the *Power* and *Will* of the *Father* and *Son*? For whether we say, as our Church doth, that the *Holy Ghost* proceeds from the *Father* and the *Son*, or, with the *Greek Church*, (which the Dr. chuseth to follow rather than our own) that He proceedeth from the *Father* by the *Son*; It can never be supposed but that, as to his *Proceffion*, the *Power* and *Will* of the *Son* did concur with the *Power* and *Will* of the *Father*, whence I have always concluded, that the dispute betwixt the Eastern and Western Churches about this matter, is no more than a Strife about Words. But be that as it will; Upon the whole it appears, that the Dr. has drawn up his Opinion in a very exceptionable manner; whereas had he express'd himself in that Form of sound Words, which He might have found in the first *Article* of our Church, viz. *In Unity of the Godhead there be three Persons of one Substance, Power and Eternity, the Father, the Son, and Holy Ghost*; and withal declared, that He believed this in the *Literal* and *Grammatical* Sense of the Words, He had Spoke home, and to the purpose. But in this Form of his

own

own Words, he hath said little or nothing satisfactory. For it is his Opinion, not of the *Eternity*, but of the *Nature* and *Essence* of the *Son* and *Holy Spirit*, which hath given the greatest Offence. But such a Declaration would have been inconsistent with his Opinions, which, in this very Paper, He acknowledges to be *particular*, and of consequence different from the Sense of the Church; and if so, I think He is obliged in conscience to renounce his *Subscriptions* to the Article. After this He declares himself willing to *Write and Preach* no more upon the Subject. This is still less satisfactory: For either the Doctrine of the Church, concerning the Trinity, is *sound*, or it is *not*: If it be *sound*, Why hath he appear'd at all against it? If it be *not*, How can he, if he be faithful in his Ministry, be at rest till She hath *reform'd* it? But yet, I must confess, the Dr. hath a *Salvo* for this. He had before publish'd his Desire, that if He were *silent* after the writing his Answer to the *Author* of some *Considerations*, &c. it might be interpreted as a Declaration, that He sees no reason to change his Sentiments, [see Reply to Mr. Nelson, &c. pag. 310.] So that His very Silence now speaks in behalf of his Sentiments; And he hath nothing more to do at present, but to look on and see the Success of his *Writings*, which his *Silence* effectually recommends to the World. But then; In what a *fraudulent* and *delusory* Manner hath he treated my *Lords* the *Bishops*? I cannot think of it, but it puts me in mind of the *Doublings* and *Shifts* of the *Hereticks* of old, when under apprehensions of the Church's Censure. He offers to be *silent*, when he had before hand taken care, that his *silence* should carry on the purposes of his *Writing*: Can He think This is a satisfactory Proposal? No, certainly. For in short, his *Silence* is now as *Criminal* as his *Writing* and *Preaching* was, and he has no way left him of making a just Satisfaction to the Church, but by a *Recantation* as *publick* as his Sermons and Books.

A brief Explication of Dr. CLARKE'S
Doctrin of the *Trinity*, by way
of Question and Answer, from
the Dr's own Writings.

Q. DO You believe there is a Trinity of Persons
in the Unity of the Godhead?

A. No; for God is but one Person. *Christ. Doctrin*,
pag. 241.

Q. What do You then believe concerning the
Trinity?

A. I believe that together with the first and su-
preme Cause or Father of all things, there have existed
from the beginning, two divine Persons, that is to say,
the *Son* and *Holy Spirit*. *Script. Doctrin*. pag. 242.

Q. What do You mean by the first and supreme
Cause, or Father of all things?

A. I mean the first Person of the Trinity, namely,
the *Father*, who *alone* is the *only true God*. Reply
to Mr. Nelson, &c. pag. 57, 60, 263.

Q. Is not the Son also *true God*?

A. The Son is by *nature* truly *God*, as truly as Man
is by *nature* truly *Man*. Reply, pag. 81.

Q. What are the essential Characters of God?

A. The *first*, and of all others the most essential
Character of God, is his being *Self-existent* and un-
originated. Reply, pag. 92.

Q. Doth this Character belong to the Son?

A. No; This Character is peculiar to the Father.
Reply, pag. 81.

Q. How then can the Son be by *nature* truly *God*,
since he wants the *first* and most essential Character
of God?

A. He hath true *divine Power* and *Dominion* communicated to him, which alone is That which makes *God* to be *God* (in the moral or religious sense of the word) ὁ παντοκράτωρ, supreme over all. Reply, pag. 81, 301.

Q. Is the Son then παντοκράτωρ or supreme over all?

A. The Son hath true divine Power and Dominion over all things, both in Heaven and Earth, but in Subordination to Him who alone is absolutely [ὁ παντοκράτωρ] of himself supreme over all. Reply, pag. 81.

Q. Since the Son is truly God, and the Father the only true God; how is it that the Scripture saith, There is but one God?

A. Because the Power of the Son, is it self the Power and Authority of the Father communicated to, manifested in, and exercised by the Son. *Script. Doctrine.* pag. 332, 333.

Q. Is not the Son of one Substance or Essence with the Father?

A. No. *Scripture Doctrine*, pag. 465.

Q. How can two Persons, essentially distinct from each other, be but one God?

A. I tell You o'er and o'er, They are one God, because They have but one Dominion and Power. Which, tho' it makes two distinct Beings, each of them, God, makes but one God. *Scripture Doctrine*, passim.

Q. What is the Holy Spirit? Is he God?

A. I dare not say he is; for he is no where call'd God in Scripture. *Script. Doctrine*, pag. 303.

Q. What is He then according to Scripture?

A. He is a *Being*, of whom greater things are spoken, and to whom higher Titles are ascribed than to any *Angel*, or other created *Being* whatsoever. *Scripture Doctrine*, pag. 302.

Q. Upon what account do you Honour God?

A.

A. Not upon the account of his *Essence* or *Substance*, to which no *Honour* is due, but upon account of his *Dignity*, *Power*, *Authority* and *Goodness*. *Scripture Doctrine*, pag. 373.

Q. What Honour is due to the *Father*?

A. Absolutely *supreme* Honour is due to Him, and only Him. *Scripture Doctrine*, pag. 352.

Q. Do You not pray to the *Son*?

A. I pray and pay all Religious Duty to the *Father*, through the *Mediation* of the *Son*. *Scripture Doctrine*, pag. 365.

Q. Is not the *Son* then a proper object of your *Prayers* and *Praises*?

A. All *Prayers* and *Praises* must be *primarily* or *ultimately* directed to the Person of the *Father* only. *Scripture Doctrine*, pag. 354.

Q. Do You pray to the *Holy Ghost*?

A. I have neither Precept nor Example for that, either in *Scripture* or primitive Writers; yet I think it reasonable to desire of Him such Gifts, as it is His Office to bestow. *Scripture Doctrine*, pag. 375.

This is a fair, though short, Representation of Dr. Clarke's Doctrine of the *Trinity*, and it appears to me, as it must needs do to every considering Reader, so full of gross Contradictions, not only to the *Scriptures*, but even to it self, as no one surely will offer to reconcile, but He that hath attempted to reconcile the Doctrine it self to the *Liturgy* and *Articles* of the *Church of England*.

N.B. The References to the *Reply* to Mr. Nelson, are not to be limited to that part of the Book which regards Mr. Nelson only, but extend to the whole Volume, in which that *Reply* is, as the number of the Pages will shew.

Sub.
ount
scrip.

, and

ther,
rine,

your

ly or
only

that,
et I
as it
375

on of
pears
ering
ly to
arely
ed to
d Ar.

elson,
hich
e Vo-
t the